

## **REMARKS**

By this amendment, Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly define their invention. In particular, claim 5 has been amended to delete the previously added limitation that a curvature of periphery portions of the mold is larger than any curvature at a center portion, and to recite that the base member having the curved surface is bonded to the pattern member having the concave-convex pattern. Dependent claims 27 and 28 have been added to define further aspects of the present invention. The foregoing amendments are supported by, e.g., the description at page 10, lines 14-24 of Applicants' specification.

In view of the foregoing amendments to claim 5, the rejection of claims 3-11, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement, is moot.

Claims 7-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicants again traverse this rejection and request reconsideration thereof.

As recognized by the Examiner, claims 7-11 are original claims. As such, claims 7-11 serve as their own written description. While it is urged in the Office Action that there is no indication that Applicants' had possession of an embodiment in which the curved based member and mold with a curved surface was used in combination with the features recited in claims 7-11, it is submitted the Office Action improperly refers only to the specific examples of the present invention and not to other portions of the specification which support the combination of the claimed feature. For example, it is submitted the disclosure at page 3, line 9 to page 4, line 25 supports the various preferred features being used together.

Accordingly, it is submitted claims 7-11 are supported by the written description.

Claims 3-5, 7-10, 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0009673 A1 to Sreenivasan et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,201,302 to Rowe. Applicants traverse this rejection and request reconsideration thereof, at least insofar as it applies to the claims as presently amended.

The present invention relates to a nanoprint mold for deforming a flat resin substrate or a flat resin film on a substrate to form a fine structure on a substrate with use of a press machine. See, e.g., Figures 9a-9c of the subject application. According to the present invention and as shown by way of example only in Figures 5a, 5b, 6a, 6, 7a-7c, 8, 9a-9c and 10, the mold includes a laminated structure including a base member having a curved surface bonded to a pattern member having a concave-convex pattern. The mold is provided with a curved surface on the side thereof on which the concave-convex pattern is formed. The mold is also provided with a deep groove (deeper than the concave portions of the concave-convex pattern) at a center portion of the mold between extending to an open to the periphery portions. By virtue of the curved surface and the deep groove, the mold is easily released from the flat resin substrate or flat resin film after forming the fine structure. With the use of the deep groove, air is introduced to the deep groove at a center of the substrate to provide a release-start point resulting in the ease of releasing the substrate from the mold after transfer printing.

The Sreenivasan et al. publication discloses a lithography process for creating patterns in an activating light curable liquid using electric fields followed by curing of the activating light curable liquid. As noted by the Examiner (see numbered section 6 of the Office Action), while the Sreenivasan et al. publication discloses a lithography process,

the imprints are preformed on flat articles. The Sreenivasan et al. publication does not disclose a mold provided with a curved surface on the side thereof on which the concave-convex pattern is formed.

The Rowe patent discloses a rubber stamp 11 having a printing surface 12, a thicker central body 13, a resilient pad 24, and a backing element 19. The stamp holder 15 has a body 16 and a threaded extension 17 carrying a nut 18. The rubber stamp 11, the resilient pad 24 and the backing element 19 are held by the flange 27, which clamps over the flange 14 of stamp 11. The outer surface of the backing member 19 is shown as spherically convex, because it is particularly adapted for use with a holder 15 for printing on spherically concave surfaces. The spherical convex surface of backing member 19 of Rowe is for printing on spherically concave surface of glass lamp bulb, but is not for facilitating the release of a rubber stamp from the glass bulb.

For the reasons set forth in the remarks accompanying the Amendment and Submission Under 37 CFR §1.114 filed August 5, 2009, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have recognized the techniques or stamp of Rowe as applicable to the process or template of Sreenivasan et al. Accordingly, it is submitted there would not have been any apparent for one ordinary skill in the art to have combined the disparate teachings of Sreenivasan et al. and Rowe.

Moreover, even assuming, arguendo, one of ordinary skill in the art would have combined the teachings of Sreenivasan et al. and Rowe, even the combined teachings would not have rendered obvious the presently claimed invention.

In Rowe, the object to be printed, i.e., the spherically concave surface of a glass lamp bulb, is not made of deformable material such as resin film or resin substrate. Thus, in Rowe, the spherical convex surface of the backing member 19 is for printing on a spherically concave surface of a glass lamp bulb. That is, the curvature of the surface

of the backing member 19 is designed to match the curvature of the surface of the bulb. The rubber stamp 11 is pressed to the surface of the glass bulb but is not pressed into the surface, i.e., it is not for deforming a flat resin substrate or a flat resin film on a substrate, as is the nanoprint mold of the present invention. Thus, the Rowe patent fails to provide any teachings with respect to release of a nanoprint mold from a flat resin substrate or a flat resin film on a substrate. Thus, there are no peeling forces acting on the stamp of Rowe.

On the other hand, the nanoprint mold of the present invention is for deforming a flat resin substrate or a flat resin film on a substrate, and, thus, in releasing the nanoprint mold from the flat resin substrate or from the flat resin film on a substrate, peeling forces act to tend peel the patterned member from the base member having a curved surface. Therefore, according to the present invention, the base member having the curved surface is bonded to the pattern member having the concave-convex pattern.

Moreover, the teachings of Rowe suggest using a curved backing member for printing on a curved surface, i.e., matching the curvature of the stamp to the surface being stamped. Since the Sreenivasan et al. publication creates patterns in a flat surface, the teachings of Rowe would teach away from the present invention, i.e. would teach matching the template to the surface. Since the surface to be imprinted in Sreenivasan et al. is flat, it is submitted the teachings of Rowe would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a flat template. Thus, the Rowe patent teaches away from the presently claimed invention in which a curved surface is used to form a fine structure on a flat resin substrate or a flat resin film.

For the foregoing reasons, the presently claimed invention is patentable over the proposed combination of Sreenivasan et al. and Rowe.

Claims 6 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sreenivasan et al. and Rowe and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0132482 A1 to Chou. Applicants traverse this rejection and request reconsideration thereof.

The Examiner has cited the Chou publication as allegedly teaching several means to soften or cure a film such as UV and heating. However, clearly nothing in Chou remedies any of the basic deficiencies noted above with respect to Sreenivasan et al. and Rowe. Accordingly, claims 6 and 11 are patentable at least for the reasons noted above.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, favorable reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims now in the application are requested.

Please charge any shortage in the fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including excess claim fees, to Deposit Account No. 01-2135 (1021.43672X00), and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP

/Alan E. Schiavelli/

Alan E. Schiavelli

Registration No. 32,087

AES/at  
1300 North Seventeenth Street  
Suite 1800  
Arlington, VA 22209  
Telephone: (703) 312-6600  
Fax: (703) 312-66662